

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>RONALD SATISH EMRIT</b> <i>Plaintiff</i>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION</b>
	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>NO. 24-CV-0129</b>
	:	
<b>SEAN “P. DIDDY” COMBS, <i>et al.</i></b> <i>Defendants</i>	:	
	:	

**O R D E R**

**AND NOW**, this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January 2024, upon consideration of Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit’s *motion to proceed in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 1), and *pro se* Complaint (ECF No. 2) it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **GRANTED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
2. The Complaint is **DEEMED** filed.
3. The Complaint is **DISMISSED, in part, with prejudice**, and, *in part, without prejudice* for the reasons set forth in the Court’s Memorandum as follows:
  - a. All claims Emrit seeks to assert on behalf of other persons are **DISMISSED, without prejudice**.
  - b. All federal law claims Emrit asserts on his own behalf are **DISMISSED, with prejudice**, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).
  - c. All state law claims Emrit seeks to assert on his own behalf are **DISMISSED, without prejudice**, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
4. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **CLOSE** this case.

5. Within fifteen (15) days of the date of this Order, Ronald Satish Emrit shall file a “Response to Order to Show Cause” not to exceed ten (10) pages stating why this Court should not, for the reasons articulated in the accompanying Memorandum, enter a pre-filing injunction directing the Clerk of Court to refuse to accept future new cases he seeks to file in this Court unless he includes a signed Declaration certifying under penalty of perjury that (1) he has not filed the same action, or a substantially similar action in any other court in the United States, (2) will not file the same action or a substantially similar action in any other court in the United States after his case is accepted for docketing in this Court, (3) venue is appropriate in this Court, providing the basis for that assertion, and (4) this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Emrit’s claims and may exercise personal jurisdiction over the named parties, and providing the basis for this Court’s ability to exercise jurisdiction.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro

**NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO**

*Judge, United States District Court*